

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 11-15, 24-29 and 31-34 are pending. Claims 2, 11 and 34 are independent.

In the Office Action dated November 8, 2007, claims 2-6, 24-29 and 31-34 were allowed, claims 11 and 13 were rejected, and claims 12, 14 and 15 were objected to.

Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,960,149 to Bujan (“Bujan”). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. The Applicant respectfully submits that Bujan does not disclose or suggest a device as claimed in claim 11 having a base with a first locking base feature and a second locking base feature, a first tab with a first locking tab feature engagable with the first locking base feature to hold the first tab in a fixed position with respect to the base, and a second tab with a second locking tab feature engagable with the second locking base feature to hold the second tab in a fixed position with respect to the base. In addition, claim 11 recites that both the first tab and the second tab are movable for compressing the tube, which is not disclosed or suggested by Bujan. Claim 11 recites that the first tab is “movable with respect to said base to a first tab compression position in which said first tab compresses the tube at a first compression location,” and the second tab is “movable with respect to said base to a second tab compression position in which said second tab compresses the tube at a second compression location different from the first compression location.” In rejecting claim 11 based on Bujan, the Office Action called the platen 33 of Bujan the “first tab” and the roller 28 of Bujan the “second tab.” While the Applicant disagrees that these features are first and second tabs with locking features as claimed, it can be seen in Bujan that the roller 28 is not movable to “a second tab compression position in which said second tab compresses the tube at a second compression location different from the first compression location,” as claimed in claim 11.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is patentable over Bujan. Claims 12-15, which depend from claim 11, are also similarly patentable over Bujan.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests further examination and allowance of all claims. If for any reason the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number given below. The Office is authorized to charge any fees associated with this Amendment, including those under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 3, 2008

By: /Douglas E. Ringel/
Douglas E. Ringel
(Reg. No. 34,416)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201

704787